

Illinois U Library

SPEECH ACTIVITIES

Vol. IX

SPRING, 1953

No. 1



Long Beach City College

\$ FOR HIGH SCHOOL SPEAKERS \$

Speech Activities

OFFERS THREE AWARDS

TOTALLING ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS

First award—\$50.00

Second award—\$30.00

Third award—\$20.00

For the best written speech by a high school speaker summarizing his understanding of the problem involved in the debate proposition for the spring term, 1953—Resolved: that the Atlantic Pact nations should form a federal union. To come within the rules of the contest the student should not submit either a pro or a con argument, but a speech of not more than 1200 words which reflects his analysis of the problem and his attitude toward solving it.

Entries should be submitted to the Managing Editor of **SPEECH ACTIVITIES** between May 1 and June 1, 1953. All entries should be accompanied by an application blank signed by both the student and his instructor. Application blanks and complete rules for the contest will be provided in the summer issue of **SPEECH ACTIVITIES** which will be available early in May.

The Nichols Publishing House

calls your attention to

It's Latest Offer for

Speech Activities

For the Sum of **\$19.95**

You may receive all copies of the Six Volumes of back numbers with the CURRENT SUBSCRIPTION for 1953.

This unusual offer can last only as long as we can supply back numbers and is limited by the number of copies we have left of any particular issue.

If you wish to get a complete file of Speech Activities, Now is the time to do it, when the best price is being offered to clear our shelves and obtain future storage space.

We call attention to the order blank below.

Nichols Publishing House
11103 East Rincon Drive,
Whittier, California

Dear Sirs:—Please send the six years of back numbers of Speech Activities and include the current 1953 subscription to the magazine. Enclosed is \$19.95 in payment..... Payment will be made of \$19.95 in 30 days..... Send bill.....

Please type or print name and address

Library _____ University _____
or Person _____ or College _____ High School _____
Signed _____ City _____
Street _____ State _____

The Nichols Publishing House

11103 EAST RINCON DRIVE

WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA

Staff of Speech Activities

Owner and Publisher: The Nichols Publishing House

Editor-in-Chief:.....EGPERT RAY NICHOLS

Associate Editor:.....E. RAY NICHOLS, JR.

COUNCIL OF ADVISORY EDITORS

EDITORS OF THE HONOR SOCIETY MAGAZINES

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS

Hugo E. Hellman, Marquette University, Milwaukee Wisconsin.

Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Chicago Division, Navy Pier, Chicago, Ill.

E. Ray Nichols, Jr., Whittier College.

Malcolm Sillars, Iowa State, Ames.

Hale Aarnes, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICE

Speech Activities is published at 11103 East Rincon Drive, Whittier, Calif. Subscription price \$4.00 a year, copies \$1.50 each. For advertising rates write to the above address. All communications concerning subscriptions, change of address, and editorial matters should be addressed to the Editor, Egbert Ray Nichols, 11103 E. Rincon Drive, Whittier, Calif. Manuscripts and contributions welcomed.

BOARD OF CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Bruno E. Jacob, Secretary, National Forensic League, Ripon, Wisconsin.

A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Carroll P. Lahman, Pasadena College, Pasadena, Calif.

Richard C. Reager, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

James N. Holm, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

Howard L. Runion, College of Pacific, Stockton, Calif.

Dallas C. Dickey, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Forrest H. Rose, S. E. Missouri State Teachers' College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana.

J. Edmund Mayer, Alhambra High School, Alhambra, California.

Brother Alexander, Sacred Heart High School, San Francisco, California.

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

	Page
National Contest in Public Discussion	1
	Wayne N. Thompson
Mr. Average Debater	3
	Jack Murphy
The Goals of Radio	4
	Kim Griffin
The Eau Claire Ballot Experiment	6
	Grace Walsh

FEATURES

The Editor in Japan	5
High School Questions for 1953-54.....	7
Presenting Long Beach City College	8
How Would You Judge This Debate?.....	11
Tournament Results	21

SPEECH ACTIVITIES

Formerly Debater's Magazine

SPRING, 1953

Copyright 1952 by

THE NICHOLS PUBLISHING HOUSE

VOLUME IX

No. 1

National Contest in Public Discussion

Wayne N. Thompson
Chicago Undergraduate Division
University of Illinois

The second annual contest in public discussion was marked by some improvement in quality and a slight increase in the number of participating colleges. The mechanics were unchanged — twenty-five minute tape recordings were prepared on the home campus and shipped to designated judging centers.

The purposes of this article are (1) to report on the outcome of the second contest, (2) to present certain critical comments, and (3) to announce plans for 1953-1954.

I

The winners for both years, along with the names of the faculty directors, are as follows:

1952-1953

1. Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire, Grace Walsh.
2. University of Illinois at Chicago, Carl A. Pitt.
3. University of Texas, Don Williams.

1951-1952

1. St. Mary's University (Texas), Bro. Aloysius J. Blume, S. M.
2. University of Houston, Otis M. Walter.
3. Iowa State College, Malcolm A. Sillars.

Iowa State, Arkansas, Grinnell,

and Bradley received quality ratings of excellent in 1952-1953.

Other participating institutions, bringing the total to nineteen from twelve states, were Oklahoma, Fordham, Wyoming, St. Mary's (Texas), Idaho State College, Eastern Illinois, William Jewell, Notre Dame, Brooklyn College, Virginia, Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy, and Manchester. The list is arranged in random order.

The writer expresses his deepest gratitude to the sectional and regional chairmen, who supervised the preliminaries, and to the critic judges. Much of the educational value is due to their detailed and penetrating written critiques.

The first phase of the contest was the sectional competition in November. Halbert Gulley (University of Illinois, Urbana), Frank Haiman (Northwestern), Les Davis (Oklahoma), Don Williams (Texas), Larry Mouat (San Jose), and the writer arranged for judging the tapes sent to their respective campuses.

All winners and the runners-up attaining a quality rating of "average" or better advanced to the regional meets. Don Olson (Nebraska), Charles Brown (Western Mich-

igan), and W. A. Behl (Brooklyn), took charge of these contests, each securing two other judges from among his colleagues.

The three winners participated in the national finals in Cincinnati on December 30. The panel of judges consisted of a radio expert and two speech professors who are truly outstanding authorities on the theory and the practice of discussion. James Peterson, Radio Station WLW, and professors A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa, and J. Jeffery Auer, University of Virginia, formed this group.

II

A year ago the writer presented his critical reactions to the first of the annual contests (See Speech Activities, summer, 1952, pp. 41-42), and to a lesser degree these observations apply once more. The basic criticism then was that the groups applied Dewey's formula of reflective thought slavishly and unintelligently. Regarding the application of the pattern as the end appeared to contribute to a neglect of other values. This year the objection is less noteworthy than it was in 1951-1952. Although the programs again followed the Dewey formula, they

showed greater flexibility and avoided making the steps obtrusive.

Other improvements in 1952-1953 were better research, greater originality of thought, and an easier style of presentation. The gains in liveness and showmanship were slight.

The quality, however, continues to be inferior to the potentialities of an able student group. The programs were heavy-handed, overly formal in style and delivery, deficient in interestingness and communicativeness, and rather poor in such mechanics of recording as microphone techniques, balance, and variety in voices. Few programs showed a sense of proportion and an appreciation of such qualities as pacing and control of tempo.

The quality of the winning record that set it distinctly above the second- and third-place winners, according to all three final judges, was maturity of thought. The Eau Claire tape had few unsupported generalizations, applied evidence instead of reciting it, and considered the topic at a relatively deep and significant level. These bases for the decision suggest to the 1953-1954 contesting groups worthwhile objectives.

Some confusion continues to exist concerning the nature of "public discussion." From the beginning the writer has labeled the national contest one in "public," not "group," discussion. The purpose is not to record an impromptu attempt at problem solving, but to present a lively instructive program.

The writer does not contend that problem solving is unimportant. Indeed, he hopes that student groups engage in intelligent research and do serious, creative thought in answering the question, "How can we give the best possible program on the national discussion topic?"

No list of phrases is definitive in describing a superior public discussion, but the following words suggest desirable attributes: clear, penetrating thought; organization appropriate to the purpose and the content; ample evidence, cogently applied and interpreted; clear, forceful language usage; varied and pleasing voice patterns; delivery that is spontaneous and communicative but free from hesitation and awkwardness; an over-all pacing that is sufficiently lively and varied to hold attention at a high level.

In Its Next Issue SPEECH ACTIVITIES

Will Present

Winning Discussion

For 1952 By

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE

Eau Claire, Wisconsin

In short, a thoughtful, serious-minded audience would receive a polished presentation that is both interesting and instructive.

III

The Third National Contest in Public Discussion is open to all junior college, colleges, and universities in the United States. Financial considerations prevent the writer's sending unsolicited announcements to every institution of higher education, but the omission of your school from the mailing list does not mean that you are unwelcome. This article is your invitation to enter.

Despite a number of requests for holding the contest later in the academic year, the writer is going to continue the early deadline. If sectional and regional contests, each accompanied by certain necessary delays, are to be completed in time for a national finals during the annual speech convention of the Christmas holidays, an early deadline is essential. Not only can such critic judges as Messrs. Baird, Auer, and Peterson be secured only at this time, but also the national meeting seems the one really appropriate date for the finals.

The rules, as listed below, are similar to those of last year:

1. Any university, college, or junior college in the United States may enter a "team" of five members. Participants must be classified by their registrars as full-time undergraduate students.
2. The discussion team will prepare a twenty-five-minute presentation recorded on single track tape at 7½ inches per second.
3. The topic will be the national discussion question. The "team" may consider the whole topic or a phase of it.
4. Tapes or their containers must give the name of the college.

Participants, although they may address each other by name, are not to reveal the name of their college.

5. The tournament management will use all reasonable precautions against the breakage, loss, or theft of the recordings, but it will assume no legal or financial responsibility. Upon the completion of the contest, all tapes will be returned to their respective owners.
6. The programs will be judged on the following criteria: (1) amount, quality, and relevance of the information; (2) originality and accuracy of thought; (3) progression of thought; (4) interestingness; and (5) delivery.
7. Awards of first, second, and third will be given to the three best programs, and evaluations of superior and excellent will be given to other worthy entrants. The decision of the judges will be final.
8. Participating colleges will receive the written comments of at least three judges.
9. The intention of entry is to be mailed by October 24, 1953, to Dr. Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago 11, Illinois. Recordings are to be shipped by the competing institutions between November 2 and 6 to the sectional center assigned by the tournament manager.
10. A fee of two dollars to cover postage, secretarial help, and administrative costs of sectional, regional, and final contests should accompany the entry.
11. For further information write to Dr. Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago 11, Illinois.

IV

The conclusion of this article must be both one of gratitude to those who helped with the Second National Contest in Public Discussion and a request for assistance in conducting the third. Volunteers to serve as sectional and regional chairmen, whose primary responsibility is arranging for the judging of a set of three to five tapes, are needed.

But most important are the recordings themselves. The hope is that the Third National Contest will surpass its predecessors in both the number and the quality of the entrants.

Mr. Average Debater

Jack Murphy
Western Michigan College

On the basis of a study of approximately one thousand former debaters listed in WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA (1950-51) the composite picture of Mr. Average Debater looks something like this:

He could belong to any of eleven categories of occupation, but the chances are greatest that he is an educator, next greatest that he is a lawyer.

He is 50 plus years old.

There is only a four per cent chance he is not married.

If he is married he has two plus children.

He has a Bachelor's degree from college, maybe more than one.

There is a 50-50 chance that he has a Master's degree.

There is about a one to five chance that he has a Doctorate.

There is a two to five chance that he has an honorary degree.

Two to five he has contributed at least one magazine article.

He has published three plus books.

He belonged to almost two professional fraternities in college.

There is about a 50-50 chance he belonged to a social fraternity.

He now belongs to about one and a half social groups.

He belongs to more than three professional organizations.

He belongs to one service or religious group.

There is a 50-50 chance he was a member of the Phi Beta Kappa.

A questionnaire was administered to a random sampling of one hundred and eighty of these former debaters in an effort to get an evaluation by these former debaters of their collegiate debating experience.

1. All who answered the questionnaire believed that forensic training had positive value.

2. Over 85% of those debaters who returned the questionnaire indicated that the "ability to compile data thoroughly" was a result of debate training. More than 88% believed this of value to them in their present positions.

3. Over 80% indicated the "ability to distinguish between the important and unimportant" was a result of debate training. Over 88% believed this of value to them in their present positions.

4. More than 88% indicated that the "ability to organize data" came from debate training. More than 88% believed this of value to them in their present positions.

5. More than 72% believed that the "ability to weigh evidence without prejudice" resulted from debate training. More than 83% stated that this was of value to them in their present positions.

6. 66% said they believed the "ability to make split-second decisions" was a result of their debate training. More than 88% believe this to be of value to them in their present positions.

7. Over 91% of the respondents indicated a belief that the "ability to support statements with valid evidence and reasoning" resulted from debate training. All persons scoring this item believed this to be of value to them in their present positions.

8. More than 93% indicated that the "ability to speak in public" resulted from debate training. Over 94% said this was of value to them in their present position.

9. Over 82% said that the "ability to think under pressure" was a result of their debate training. Over 88% believed this to be of value to them in their present occupation.

10. 88% or more indicated that

the "ability to analyze the statements of others" resulted from their debate training. All respondents to this item said this was of value to them in their present position.

11. More than 51% indicated that the "ability to win or lose gracefully" resulted from debate training. Over 70% said this was of value to them in their present occupation.

12. The claimed assets most universally agreed upon by the respondents to have resulted from debate training were the "ability to speak in public" and the ability to support statements with valid evidence and reasoning." That alleged asset least apt to come from debate training according to the former debaters was the "ability to win or lose gracefully."

13. There was greatest agreement that the "ability to speak in public" and the "ability to support statements with valid evidence and reasoning" were most valuable to the respondents in their present occupations. (These were also the two skills most likely to result from debate training). The "ability to win or lose gracefully" was of least value to the former debaters in their present position. (It was also indicated to be the least apt to result from debate training).

14. Over 46% of the debaters who returned questionnaires said that debating did not develop "sarcasm."

15. More than 67% believed that debating did not develop a "suspicious nature."

16. 32% or more did not believe that debating developed "contentiousness." 49% or less believe that to some degree debate training developed "contentiousness."

17. Over 67% believed that debating did not develop "insincerity."

(Continued on page 24)

The Goals of Radio

Kim Griffin
University of Kansas

I

I have been led to believe that this column is interested in radio and video discussion programs. I have been led further to believe that it is interested in the criticism of such programs.

Before we can criticize, we have to obtain a standard of judgment. Before we can formulate a defensible standard, we should have expert knowledge based upon sound evidence. Before we can get much evidence, we must measure or evaluate. Before we can evaluate, we must have some criteria by which to validate our measurements.

Thus it would seem that we, like a bear in a cage, must go around and around in a charmed circle. Where can that circle be broken? Where can we start? If we must pull ourselves up by our own boot straps, so to speak, where are those boot straps?

It is my belief that we can start by listing "possible goals" of such programs. These goals are developed by logical consideration of objectives which might be achieved by such programs, that is, objectives which would be socially desirable. These objectives would have to be valuable contributions to our society.

The purpose of this article is to present an analysis of the possible goals of discussion programs on radio and television. The term "discussion" is used here in the sense in which it has come to be used popularly in referring to such programs as the American Forum of the Air, the People's Platform and the University of Chicago Round Table. Such programs collectively incorporate elements frequently associated with the forum, group discussion, and debate. More specifically, each of these programs has the following elements: (1) topics or questions are considered by a number of persons in a face-to-face group; (2) various viewpoints are expressed;

(3) the participants are sometimes aligned on "sides"; (4) the formats may include short speeches followed by panel discussions and/or questions by members of the studio audience.

Such programs have come to be looked upon with favor by the radio and video industry. They have been accepted generally by the listening public and acclaimed by the critics of radio and television.

The present analysis of goals for such programs is valuable for at least two reasons. In the first place, such an analysis provides the criteria by which we may validate measurement of the experimental results of various techniques. Secondly, analysis of these goals provides the basis for a standard of judgment by which we may evaluate these programs.

There is a distinct need for such evaluation. Social psychologists have stated that such programs are influential in shaping public opinion. Students of propaganda have shown that occasionally a group of more or less well-meaning individuals has presented programs through which they propose to influence audiences by what they call discussion. These groups have a well-planned program in which each participant contributes carefully selected information, all of which has been expertly chosen to lead to one conclusion—the proposition advocated by the members of the group. In this way an unsuspecting audience is given choice propaganda under the guise of unbiased "discussion" in which all representative points of view are supposedly presented. Such a speaking situation should not be credited with the title, "panel discussion"; neither should it be called a "symposium"; it might better, in the writer's opinion, be called a "persuadium". Such programs should be exposed by expert criticism and labeled for what

they are: a series of related, short, informal, persuasive speeches.

Critical evaluation of radio and video discussion programs, if based upon a sound analysis of possible goals and well-designed experimental investigation, would provide the following desirable results: (1) It would reveal the extent to which our present body of knowledge about discussion techniques is being employed on radio and video; (2) it would show how and to what extent such discussion programs implement social action; (3) it would aid in setting up standards of excellence; (4) it would give us further insight into the problem of propaganda analysis; (5) it would indicate the limits of our present knowledge of radio and video discussion techniques; (6) it would aid in the formulation of new theory concerning discussion techniques; (7) it would supplement our present theories of speech criticism by providing additional information about a specific type of speaking situation. In brief, we need to evaluate carefully radio and television discussion programs because they are a very important social instrument.

II

We may now raise the question, what are the possible goals of radio and television discussion? What can we hope to accomplish by such broadcasts? The objectives here enumerated are not to be considered individually as a possible goal for any one broadcast; they are to be viewed as the possible goals of such broadcasts collectively.

One goal could be to present information. We can, for example, describe the latest discovery of medical research, the University of Chicago Round Table recently did. This objective entails great care in securing the facts; it requires unbiased observation and reliable testimony. The most valuable type of information will be closely related to the

social, economic, ethical, moral, religious, and political questions which are faced by the ordinary citizen.

Another goal of these programs can be to interpret information. We can present representative points of view concerning the significance of events and situations which are more or less common knowledge, such as the results of an election or the development of the hydrogen bomb. This objective implicitly requires exact knowledge. It also calls for consideration of as many reasonable points of view as possible. Again, the value of such interpretations will be measured in terms of their application to problems faced by the members of the listening public.

A third goal of radio and video discussion programs can be to present analysis of current problems, such as our current difficulties with Russia or the intricacies of an unbalanced national budget. This objective requires the consideration of all points of view which are currently held by intelligent and interested persons. It requires exact knowledge of the extent and nature of the problem. It necessitates an intelligent use of logical principles in tracing the cause of the difficulty. The value of such analyses will depend, again, upon their relation to the problems faced by these persons who listen to the broadcasts.

A fourth goal can be to present evaluations of proposals for the solving of important public problems, such as the Brannan Farm Plan. The objective requires familiarity with the related problem, its extent, nature, and causes. It further requires the intelligent use of logical principles in weighing the merits of the proposition. It also calls for consideration of other representative proposals or alleged solutions.

A fifth goal of radio and television discussion programs could be to demonstrate the democratic process. Social psychologists tell us that many persons are relatively unfamiliar with this process, i.e., the practical techniques for solving their mutual problems. Political scientists tell us that the basic assumption of American democracy is that "We, the People," are able to employ the process of reflective thinking and work out a cooperative political and social program. From a practical point of view, the

(Continued on page 20)

The Editor in Japan

Public Listening

From the University of Redlands to the Imperial University of Sendai (Tohoku) is a change of significant proportions, indeed! It is a change not to be measured in miles alone; it is a change in philosophy, in manners, even in the rhythm of daily living. When one gets used to the fact that time means little to the oriental he has learned only the first lesson. One that is even more arresting for the teacher of speech is the Japanese attitude toward speaking in public. He will smile and remain silent. According to one of my colleagues, public speaking in Japan is public listening.

My students at Tohoku have listened very well during this first semester. I hope during the next term to encourage them to enter into debate and discussion as students in the Tokyo area are doing. They may prefer, however, to smile and listen. Should this be the case, it would be a further indication of the extreme difference between the Western and Asiatic cultures. In America we are only beginning to emphasize listening as such.

Japan, in her heroic effort to become a democracy in reality, is undergoing a great change and is slowly tracing the way. Debate and public discussion are beginning to play a part in the process. In the Tokyo area debate among the colleges has become a reality. It has been sponsored by T. Kanchi, a young man on the staff of the Tokyo newspaper, Asahi Shimbun. Mr. Kanchi is a graduate of the University of Southern California and although he did not engage in forensic activity as an undergraduate, one of his first projects in post war Japan was to organize a debating league among the nearby colleges. This league has now been active for three years.

The Intercollegiate English Debating Contest

In "The First Intercollegiate English Debating Contest" held on September 20, 1950, eight colleges participated. They were Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo University of Commerce, St. Paul's University, Tokyo University, Waseda University, Keio University, Meiji Univer-

sity, and Gakushuin College. Mr. T. Kanchi acted as chairman, and Mr. N. Itabashi, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the International Education and Culture Association gave the opening address. In addition to these sponsors, mention should be made of the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, the Nippon Times, and the International Students Association of Japan.

The subjects used in this first competition will give an indication of the problems which are occupying Japanese thought: Resolved: that the Japanese language should be Romanized; resolved: that birth control should be enforced by law in order to check the increase of population in Japan; resolved: that school uniforms should be abolished; resolved: that Japan should remain neutral.

"The Third Intercollegiate English Debating Contest" was held on September 6, 7, 8, and 13, 1952. Instead of eight colleges, twenty-two participated. In addition to the ones named above, the following were included: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Aoyama Gakuin Woman's Junior College, Tokyo University of Education, Nihon University, Ibaragi University, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo Woman's Christian College, Sophia University, Meiji Gakuin College, Seikei University, Chuo University, Chiba University, Tokyo University (New system), Tokyo University (Old system).

Again, the subjects indicate the nature of Japanese interest: resolved: that the labor union in Japan should be prohibited from participating in any political strike; resolved: that our national anthem should be changed; resolved: that the 6-3-3-4 education system should be maintained in Japan; resolved: that the co-educational system should be abolished in Japan; resolved: that gambling on bicycle races should be outlawed in Japan; resolved: that pin-ball machine establishments should be outlawed in Japan.

Much credit for the development of forensic activity in Japan is due both to T. Kanchi of the Asahi Shim-

(Continued on page 10)

The Eau Claire Ballot Experiment

GRACE WALSH
Wisconsin State College
Eau Claire

For some time there has been an undercurrent of doubt about the advisability of the present method used to select winners at the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament. I used to wonder about it myself when I was among the coaches, and since I have become a judge of that tournament I have listened carefully to the coaches' criticisms. It seemed advisable to try something else to see if the coaches would prefer it.

At the State Teachers' Milwaukee convention, after discussing this matter with Mr. Schacht, Secretary of the Wisconsin Forensic Association, I suggested that the quality rating used in all other events sponsored by the Forensic Association be applied to debate as well. With a narrow base of only six debates, counting nothing but winning or losing, it seemed to many coaches that the Madison results had little correlation with the quality of debating done by the teams at that tournament. There was a parallel to this problem at the Northwest Debate Tournament, which was attended by about seventy colleges and universities every year. There it was decided to use a team quality rating in addition to the winning and losing of a debate in picking the finalists. The coaches preferred this method over the old plan and so it has become the accepted way of picking the teams who participate in the final rounds. That is why I offered to run the annual high school debate tournament at Eau Claire using a modification of that principle in picking the winners of that tournament.

This tournament was held on January 10 and was attended by ninety pairs of teams, or three-hundred sixty debaters, and ninety judges, from a two-state area. Prior to that tournament an explanation of the

new judging method for picking winners was sent to all participating schools. The method, briefly, was this: Schools were rated Superior, Excellent, and Average, with a Superior team getting three points, an Excellent team two points, and an Average team one point. The winning team received three additional points for winning the debate. Final winners were determined by the highest winning points added to the team's total rating. A questionnaire was submitted to the head coach of each school and this was filled out before any tournament results were announced. The items in the questionnaire, and the answers given by the coaches should be most interesting to debate coaches all over Wisconsin and especially to the officers of our organization. Twenty-nine coaches, out of thirty-nine schools attending answered the questionnaire.

The questions asked included these: The school enrollment; whether teams from that school had participated in the state final debates in Wisconsin; whether the present method of determining winners of the state final debates was considered satisfactory, when only wins and losses were counted; if the coached preferred the method used for selecting winners at the Eau Claire tourney; and the last two items gave a place for any written comment and an opportunity for suggesting any other method the coach may recommend for awarding places at the state meet.

The synopsis of the questionnaire reveals the following information: Among the twenty-two Wisconsin coaches who responded, fourteen had their teams participating in the state final debates. Seven of the twenty-two were satisfied with the present plan of six debates. Three did not respond to the ques-

tion, and twelve were dissatisfied. Among the seven who considered the present plan satisfactory, four preferred the method used at Eau Claire; one who did not respond to the question preferred the method at Eau Claire. It is interesting to note that the Wisconsin schools represented have combined school enrollment of 14,454 students.

It may interest the Wisconsin coaches to know how our neighbors across the border reacted. The schools which the coaches of Minnesota represented totaled 6,320 students. Of the seven coaches responding, one was a former Wisconsin coach who had teams in the Wisconsin State Tournament, from the different cities where he had taught. None of the others had had teams participating in the state final debates in Wisconsin. One considered the present method satisfactory; three were dissatisfied with the present method; and three did not respond. All preferred the method used at Eau Claire.

From the comments given by the coaches, the members of the Board may get some other ideas about how winners should be picked. Without any attempt at classification, here are the Wisconsin coaches' comments:

"While it is very likely that judges will agree that one team is superior to another in a given debate, their evaluation of a team as being Superior, Excellent, or Average will probably vary a great deal.

I prefer a straight wins and losses method of picking a champion. If teams tie then resort to individual ratings."

"... insofar as rules go I do think, as I have said, your new set of provisions should give us greater accuracy in choosing champions..."

High School Questions For 1953-54

1) This year's debate topic for the remainder of the school year is:

Resolved: That the Atlantic Pact Nations should form a federal union.

2) This year's discussion question is: What form of international organization should the United States support?

A. Plan for next year:

The meeting of delegates also voted that the present plan of choosing problem areas for discussion and debate be continued for next year with the removal of that part of the original motion which restricts the NUBA Committee to one of the three propositions selected the previous December provided, however, that the proposition shall be chosen from the announced problem area.

This proposal was approved by the NUBA Committee and in consequence thereof, the work of the committee, delegates, and other interested persons at the Monday afternoon and evening sessions in Cincinnati was directed to the end of choosing three problem areas with three discussion questions and three debate propositions under each. These problem areas, questions, and propositions were referred to a committee on wording which consisted of Bower Aly, Robert Schacht,

Bruno Jacob, L. R. Kremer, E. R. Rankin, and Gregg Phifer. This committee sought the advice and counsel of many persons in the field of speech and also in the subject matter areas concerned. They are now ready to submit this report to you.

B. Three Problem Areas

I. How Should We Select the President of the United States?

Discussion Questions

1. What are the problems of choosing the president of the United States?
2. How can the method of nominating presidential candidates be improved?
3. How can the method of electing the president of the United States be improved?

Debate Propositions

1. Resolved: That the President of the United States should be elected by the direct vote of the people.
2. Resolved: That the electoral vote of each of the states should be cast in proportion to its popular vote.
3. Resolved: That the President of the United States should be elected by the Congress.

II. How Can Labor Management Relations Be Improved?

Discussion Questions

1. What are the problems of labor-management relations?

2. What are the causes of industrial peace?

3. What can labor, management, and government do to improve their mutual relations?

Debate Propositions

1. Resolved: That the closed shop should be extended throughout American industry.
2. Resolved: That the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed.
3. Resolved: That labor unions are detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

III. How Can We Preserve Individual Freedoms in the United States?

Discussion Questions

1. What constitutional rights should American Citizens possess?
2. How are the rights of American citizens endangered?
3. How can Americans preserve both their liberty and their security?

Debate Propositions

1. Resolved: That the members of Congress should be subject to civil libel suits for statements made in Congress.
2. Resolved: That immunity for statements made in Congress should extend only to members of Congress.
3. Resolved: That congressional investigation of un-American activities should be discontinued.

(Continued from page 6)

"Prefer more rounds of debate."

"Would prefer the individual ratings to be broken up into the various elements of debate (refutation, delivery, etc.). If these were rated on a scale of 1-5, that total could then serve as the speaker's individual rating.

I have asked my debaters how they liked the Eau Claire ballot, and all of them preferred a rating scale which would show in what aspects they were strong and in which ones they fell down. I do approve of the top part of the ballot, however."

"Preference for five rounds of debate."

"Have not made up my mind.

Suggest that ballot contain place for things such as: Evidence, refutation, etc. (as in ballot used last year). Have points speaker gets be on sum total of rating based on ballot used last year. In this way student can see where he is weak."

"Prefer the principle used at Eau Claire but not the specific method—would prefer five rounds of debate to either. Five rounds—win or loss basis."

"Give the method used at Eau Claire in 1953 a try and see what is what from the outcome."

"The new Eau Claire plan has its good points. More can be

told after computation of results."

"Prefer five rounds of debate at State tourney."

"This is fine."

"New plan partially compensates for the undesirable experience of losing a debate."

"Could each debater be rated from 1-5 on points such as organization, refutation, etc? The system of team scoring could be left as is, and individual debaters could still have a sum total of points between 1-20. This would show the individual debater where his weaknesses appear."

"It takes a little more of the
(Continued on page 10)

Presenting Long Beach City College

The story of Long Beach City College is the story of a dream that came true. It is the story of a college which opened in 1927 with an enrollment of 673, survived an earthquake that destroyed its building, constructed a new campus in the face of depression and within a quarter century became the second largest two-year college in the nation. Its present enrollment of 10,000 full-time students is divided between its two campuses. The liberal arts division was moved in 1935 to the Lakewood campus in the heart of Long Beach's residential development, Lakewood Village. The business and technology division is in downtown Long Beach.

The liberal arts division concerns itself with two years of accredited college courses which entitle students to continue on to upper division colleges and universities. Increasing consideration is given to elective courses of a popular nature aimed directly at preparing students for successful and effective citizenship.

Instruction in speech is carried on in the areas of forensics, radio, drama, and speech testing and improvement. Entering freshmen are tested for speech ability, recorded, and urged to enroll in classes and activities which will provide them the greatest opportunity for improvement or for the further devel-

opment of their talents. H. David Cooke is in charge of the screening program and also serves as Director of Forensics.

Competitive forensics is well established at Long Beach City College. As well as being an active participant in the activities of the Southern California Collegiate Forensic Association, the school has sent its debaters, orators, and extemp speakers to contests in all parts of the state. In the fall of 1952, the forensic students, under Professor Cooke, were host to colleges and universities throughout the western states which participated in an invitational debate tournament. Two hundred and fifty students from

Debate in Progress at Long Beach City College.



Tournament Results

MILLSAPS COLLEGE Jackson, Mississippi December 17, 1952

A summary of results in the Thirteenth Annual Millsaps Debate Tournament is attached. A total of 65 teams representing 21 colleges and universities in 7 states participated in the tournament. Trophies were presented to the first and second place winners in each division.

The Louisiana College team from Pineville, Louisiana, composed of Stan Clark and Tom Hall, took top honors in the Men's Division, defeating Bob Rudkin and Royce Hanson of Central (Okla.) State College in the finals. In the semi-finals Clark and Hall had defeated Thomas Matheny and Win Landry of Southeastern Louisiana College, while Rudkin and Hanson had defeated Bill Kilgarlin and Ed Thompson of the University of Houston. Other teams reaching the quarter-finals were from the University of Alabama, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and Louisiana State University (two teams).

In the Women's Division two teams from the University of Alabama, composed of Dorothy Sall, Carolyn Regan, Martha Hewes, and Barbara Horn, defeated both L. S. U. teams in the semi-finals and thus took home both first and second place trophies. The L. S. U. teams were composed of Ellen Martin, Sara Lathan, Carita Martin, and Ann Harris. Other schools reaching the quarter-finals were Mississippi College, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Northwestern Louisiana State College, and Stephen F. Austin College.

The only team to go through the entire tournament undefeated was the Louisiana State University team of William Moss and Harry Sachse, who took first place in the Junior Division by defeating Lee Curtis and Kenneth Silvey of Centenary College in the finals. In the semi-finals these two teams had eliminated, respectively, Beth Dubus and Marilyn Gayle Domingue of Southwestern Louisiana Institute and Joan Laravia and Marilyn Mitchell of L. S. U. Other teams reaching the quarter-finals were from Howard

(Continued on page 23)

THE PI KAPPA DELTA INVITATIONAL SPEECH TOURNAMENT

March 12 and 14, 1953
Pepperdine College
Los Angeles, California
Emmett Long, Director

SWEEPSTAKES RESULTS

VARSITY DIVISION

- 2nd San Diego State College—93
- 1st Pepperdine College—99

LOWER DIVISION

- 2nd Los Angeles City College—59
- 1st University of Southern California—76

RESULTS

Extemp

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

- 2nd tie Betty Dobkin, University of Southern California
- Sally Rochlin, University of Southern California
- Patricia Amon, Pasadena City College
- 1st Grace Morheim, Los Angeles City College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

- 2nd Ron Weintraub, University of Southern California
- 1st Andy Brown, San Diego State College

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

- 2nd tie Pat Drake, College of the Pacific
- Marcy Brooks, San Diego State College
- 1st Sara Longman, San Diego State College

UPPER DIVISION MEN

- 2nd Bo Jansen, University of Southern California
- 1st Joel Snyder, San Diego State College

ORATORY

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

- 2nd Marguerite Cooper, University of Southern California
- 1st Alice Baker, Los Angeles City College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

- 2nd Lou Kohn, Pepperdine College
- 1st Robert Wallach, University of Southern California

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

- 2nd Helen Bustard, Pepperdine College
- 1st Sara Longman, San Diego State College

(Continued on page 23)

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE NINTH ANNUAL SPEECH MEET

The worst of weather could not stop the influx of eighty-one debate teams from a seven-state area which turned into Eau Claire for the Ninth Annual Speech Meet. With them were discussors, orators, extemporaneous speakers, folktale spinners, and after-dinner jokesters.

The first scheduled event was Group Discussion. The subject for this event was, "How Can We As a Nation Best Combat the Threat of Communism?" Of the seventy-nine speakers entered in the event, seventy-five were there at the start with only one group of four from South Dakota State College at Brookings too late to participate because of driving in a blizzard from noon until ten o'clock at night. The highest scorer in this event was Tom Pettit of Iowa State Teachers College, with Norbert Tlachac and George Gerner, both of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, coming in for second high.

Starting on Friday morning were the elimination rounds in Folklore which is the telling of a story that has been passed down by word of mouth in the literature of the people. In the final contest, first place went to Paul Lee of St. Olaf, second place to James Carroll of St. Mary's College, and third place to Robert Hilton of Bethel.

The next completed event was Original Oratory which is a ten-minute original serious message. In this event, first place went to George Gerner of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, second place to Diane Koarff of Macalester, and third place to Frank Nelson of St. Olaf College.

In Extemporaneous Speaking where each contestant had one hour in which to draw, prepare a talk on the subject drawn, and deliver a talk on a problem of national or international importance, first place went to Joan Reidy of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, second place went to Richard Ohm of St. Thomas College, and third place to Shirley Langrack of Northwestern Schools.

(Continued on page 23)

Tournament Results

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY INVITATIONAL TOURNAMENT

Host—Louisiana State University
Directors—Waldo W. Braden, Professor of Speech, L. S. U.

Lenore E. Evans, Assistant Director of Debate, L. S. U.

January 17 and 18, 1953

Type of Contest—Debate and extemporaneous speaking. Senior Men, Senior Women, and Junior divisions

Subject—National Question

Winners—Debate

a. Junior—1st, Louisiana College
2nd, (tie) Mississippi College
Mississippi Southern College

b. Senior Women—1st, Southwestern Louisiana Institute
2nd, Mississippi College

c. Senior Men—1st, (tie) Midwestern University of Wichita Falls, Texas
Southwestern Louisiana Institute

d. Extemporaneous speaking:

1st. M. J. Broussard of Southeastern Louisiana Institute
2nd, Stanley Clark of Louisiana College

3rd, Gus Weill of Louisiana State University

SOUTHERN REGIONAL TAU KAPPA ALPHA DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Host—Louisiana State University
Directors—Waldo W. Braden, Professor of Speech, L. S. U.

William Vanderpool, Assistant Director of Debate, L. S. U.

December 5 and 6, 1952

Divisions of Contest—One Negative and One Affirmative Team from each school

Subject—National Question

First place affirmative (tie)

John Bahcall and Arnold Lincove of Louisiana State University
Arlene Amend and Katherine Skogstad of Florida State University

First place negative

William Moss and Harry Sachse of Louisiana State University

STATE OF MAINE INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE TOURNEY

Bowdoin College won the State of Maine Inter-Collegiate Debate Tourney, which was held at Bates College on March 14. Bates College was second, and the University of Maine third.

Twentieth Annual ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE SPEECH TOURNAMENT

February 13 and 14, 1953

FRED J. BARTON, Director

Sweepstakes

DEBATE

SENIOR MEN: 1st Central State;
2nd Baylor. JUNIOR MEN: 1st Baylor, 2nd U. of Houston. SENIOR WOMEN: 1st Northwestern State;
2nd Central State. JUNIOR WOMEN: 1st Baylor; 2nd U. of Oklahoma.

INDIVIDUAL CONTESTS:

Men's Poetry Reading:

1. Dave Kendrick, Northwestern State

2. Malcolm Huckabee, Wayland

Women's Poetry Reading:

1. Ellen Hurt, Central State

2. Ann Barnett, SMU

Men's Oratory:

1. Royce Hanson, Central State

2. Bill Brice, SMU

Women's Oratory:

1. Ann Barnett, SMU

2. Helen Tanner, Central State

Men's After Dinner Speaking:

1. Bill Brice, SMU

2. Larry Hargrove, Baylor

Women's After Dinner Speaking:

1. Ann Fowler, TCU

2. Ellen Rotsch, TCU

Men's Bible Reading:

1. Peter Dart, ACC

2. Burnie Burrus, U. of Houston

Women's Bible Reading:

1. Martha Kinkaid, Austin College

2. Ann Barnett, SMU

Men's Extempore Speaking:

1. Bill Wantland, Oklahoma

2. Bill Kilgarlin, U. of Houston

Women's Extempore Speaking:

1. Ann Torrans, Northwestern State

2. Helen Tanner, Central State

Men's Radio Speaking:

1. George Wead, St. Mary's

2. Cled Wimbish, ACC

Women's Radio Speaking:

1. Frankie Bozeman, ACC

2. Evelyn Crouch, North Texas

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Pasadena, California

Lester McCreery, Director

RESULTS

UPPER DIVISION MEN:

1st Lyndell Cheeves and Art Snyder—Pepperdine.

2nd place tie

Wassill and Adams—Ucla

Myers and Jacobson—Stanford

3rd place tie

Hosler and Wooster—Stanford

Suddleson and Morrow—Pepperdine

Chase and Glickman—Pepperdine

LOWER DIVISION MEN

1st Robert Ryle and Martin Roth—California's Institute of Technology

2nd Tom Burton and Ronald Stephens—Weber College, Utah

3rd tie Ronald Apperson and Lynne Perry—Pomona College
Murray Bring and Ron Weintraub—University of Southern California

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

1st Klonda Bowers and Sally Goodman—Arizona State College

2nd Jennie Warriner and Marcy Brooks, San Diego State College

3rd tie Mary Neely and Helen Bustard—Pepperdine
Kelley and Frostig—Occidental College

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

1st place Sally Bird and Ada Picazen—San Diego State College

2nd Rocklin and Dobkin—University of Southern California (first names limited)

3rd tie Smith and Boies—Pepperdine

Tomich and Lanzoretta—Pasadena City College

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN Milwaukee Extension Division

On March 7, the Milwaukee Extension Division held its tournament under the direction of T. J. McLaughlin.

Three rounds of conventional debating for teams of Novice standing on the national question were won by the following schools:

1st — University of Wisconsin (Madison)

2nd — Marquette University

3rd — Wisconsin State College (Milwaukee)

DON'T FORGET TO JUDGE THE DEBATE IN THIS ISSUE. SEND THE BALLOT INSIDE BACK COVER TO SPEECH ACTIVITIES

**11103 E. RINCON DRIVE
WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA**

MILLSAPS, Continued from page 21
College, Louisiana College, Mississippi State College for Women, and Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

Of the 161 debates held during the tournament, 93 were won by the affirmative and 68 by the negative. There were 143 affirmative ballots and 98 negative. In the preliminary rounds there were 68 affirmative and 53 negative votes. In the elimination rounds the score was 75 affirmative and 45 negative. This is the first question on which we have ever had a really one-sided tournament.

There is attached also a summary of the ratings given by the judges to the individual speakers. On the basis of these ratings, Bill Kilgarlin of the University of Houston and Royce Hanson of Central averaged highest in the Men's Division, Anne Torrens of Northwest Louisiana in the Women's Division, and Beth Dubus of S. L. I. and Harry Sachse of L. S. U. in the Junior Division.

In the Contest in Oratory there was a tie for first place between Gus Weill of Louisiana State University and Royce Hanson of Central. Other finalists were Louis Lusk and Helen Rosen of the University of Alabama, Tom Hall of Louisiana College, Beth Dubus of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Patricia Barron of Howard College, and Bill Kilgarlin of the University of Houston. A total of 20 contestants participated in the preliminaries.

For the third successive year Murray Havens of the University of Alabama was the winner in the Extemporaneous Speech contest, in which 23 contestants took part. Tom Hall of Louisiana College was second. Other finalists were Helen Rosen of the University of Alabama, Bill Kilgarlin and Ed Thompson of the University of Houston, Anne Torrens of Northwestern Louisiana State College, Harry Sachse of L. S. U., and Irving Fuller of the University of Mississippi.

This tournament is an annual event, and for future years is scheduled for the first week-end in December. Your criticisms and suggestions for improving the tournament will be welcomed.

E. S. WALLACE

Tournament Director

PEPPERDINE, Continued from Pg 21

UPPER DIVISION MEN

2nd Bo Jansen, University of Southern California

1st James Smith, University of Southern California

RESULTS

Discussion

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Betty Dobkin, University of Southern California

1st Alice Baker, Los Angeles City College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

2nd Rod Skager, University of Redlands

1st Norman Marshall, Pasadena City College

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Betty Wilcoxon, University of Southern California

1st Mary Neely, Pepperdine College

UPPER DIVISION MEN

2nd Joel Snyder, San Diego State College

1st Are Snyder, Pepperdine College

INTERPRETATION

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Joan Reynolds, University of California, Santa Barbara

1st Charlene Dories, Valley College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

2nd John Celano, Long Beach City College

1st Tommy Lasswell, Palomar College

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Joan Elmes, Pepperdine College

1st Claire Garrett, Los Angeles State College

UPPER DIVISION MEN

2nd Topper Smith, Long Beach State College

1st Dion Morrow, Pepperdine College

RESULTS

Impromptu

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Ria Lanzorotta, Pasadena City College

1st Jackie Friedman, Los Angeles City College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

2nd Jack Warner, University of Southern California

1st Charles Orr, Brigham Young University

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Betty Jacinto, College of the Pacific

1st Mary Neely, Pepperdine College

UPPER DIVISION MEN

2nd Dan Weston, San Diego State College

1st Chandler Maloy, San Francisco State College

DEBATE

LOWER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Carmel Todaro and Pat Harper, San Francisco State College

1st Ada Picaizen and Sally Bird, San Diego State College

LOWER DIVISION MEN

2nd Charles Orr and Eldon Haag, Brigham Young University

1st Murray Bring and Ron Weintraub, University of Southern California

UPPER DIVISION WOMEN

2nd Helen Bustard and Mary Neely, Pepperdine College

1st Marcy Brooks and Jennie Wariner, San Diego State College

UPPER DIVISION MEN

2nd Art Snyder and Lyndell Cheeves, Pepperdine College

1st Lewis Acord and Joel Snyder, San Diego State College

EAU CLAIRE, Continued from Pg. 21

The subject for After-Dinner Speaking was "Whither America?" This was the entertainment feature of the Speech Meet. All of the speakers and their coaches attended the luncheon at Christ Church Parish House which was given through the courtesy of the Northern State Power Co. of Eau Claire. A specially chartered bus took the delegation to the luncheon as a courtesy of the Eau Claire Transportation Co. Following the luncheon the eliminations were held and the five finalists appeared before the banquet attended by 252 people in the College Union on Friday evening. Ralph Zimmermann of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, received first place in the finals while second place went to Milton Erway of Northwestern Schools, and third place to James Carroll of St. Mary's College.

The last event of the Speech Meet was debate which was divided into two divisions. The first division where entry was not so limited, showed six competing schools with a maximum entry of four teams each. The schools were: Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, Iowa State Teachers, Concordia Junior College, St. Olaf, Bethel, U. of Wisconsin and the U. of Minnesota. All teams debated in five rounds with each team debating both sides on alternating sides of the question, "Resolved: That the Congress of the United States Should Enact a Compulsory Fair Employment Practices Law." In the first division debate five places were named. First place went to Norbert Tlachac and George Gerner of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire. They composed the only team with five wins and no losses. Second place went to Linsley and

(Continued on page 24)

Attention:

Speech Teachers and Debate Coaches



HERE IS THAT RECORDER YOU WANT: Listen! You can put a full hour program on one edge of a half-hour tape with an Eicor! You still have the other edge left for another hour recording, for the Eicor is a twin track recorder. That's economy! AND CHECK THESE THINGS: In addition to the record you get, you can teach with a Recorder—Play one speech and have one of your debaters answer it — then play the next speech on the recording and compare — will that get up a profitable discussion! — And you can buy recordings and train your teams against the best!

Also, you can take speeches off the radio for future class use. Moreover, the Eicor is ideal for taking off the Mss., as it has a foot pedal which stops and starts in the middle of a word! Beat this for dictation!

For special prices to Speech Departments write to:

INSTITUTE SUPPLY AGENCY

125 EAST FERN AVENUE, REDLANDS, CALIFORNIA

HOLLYWOOD TROPHY COMPANY



1152 N. WESTERN AVE.
HOLLYWOOD 29, CALIF.

CITROGRAPH PRINTING CO.

*Book and
Magazine
Publishers*

**Redlands, California
113 East State Street**

SPEECH ACTIVITIES BALLOT
Spring, 1953

JUDGE'S RATING OF SPEAKERS:

(For each item from 1 through 8, give not less than 10 points nor more than 20 points to each speaker. A rating of 10 will indicate minimum effectiveness. A rating of 20 will indicate maximum effectiveness).

Effectiveness in:	1st Aff	2nd Aff	Tot.	1st Neg	2nd Neg	Tot
1. Skill in analysis						
2. Adequacy of organization						
3. Knowledge of subject						
4. Presentation of evidence						
5. Use of reasoning						
6. Refutation and rebuttal						
7. Style of presentation						
8. Ethical considerations						
Totals:						

(Any ballot on which any rating is omitted or where instructions above are not followed or where all totals are not completed, cannot be used in the tabulation of results).

JUDGE'S DECISION OF THE DEBATE:

(Fill in below the statement which most closely approximates your attitude).

1. I cast my ballot for the affirmative....., for the negative....., on the basis of my ratings above.
2. I wish to record a "win" for both the affirmative and negative.....on the ground that:
 - a.....both are superior teams and neither should be penalized by a "loss."
 - b.....other justification:
3. I wish to record a "loss" for both the affirmative and negative.....on the ground that:
 - a.....there was no clash in this debate.
 - b.....Both teams have made an inferior presentation and neither should be credited with a "win."
 - c.....other justification:

Signed

I am an instructor.....student in college.....student in high school.....

The Nichols Publishing House

Calls Your Attention to the

Following Publications:

1. **WRITING THE COLLEGE ORATION** — By E. R. Nichols — A Rhetorical Treatise with Illustrative College Orations of various Types — Many Unusual **\$3.50**
2. **THE INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE SERIES** — Three volumes with a fourth in preparation. Each contains about seven college debates of recent date **\$3.50**
3. **THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ORATORY SERIES** — Three volumes with a fourth in preparation. Each contains about 24 college orations of various types. Excellent supplement to **WRITING THE COLLEGE ORATION** **\$2.50**
4. **WEST POINT TOURNAMENT DEBATES, Vol. I.** Taken from recordings made at the tournament. Valuable to teams planning to attend West Point tournament **\$3.50**
5. **ORATORICAL DECLAMATIONS, Vol. I.** Edited by E. R. Nichols. A group of declamations taken from recordings **\$3.00**
6. **1951-52 COLLEGE AND HIGH SCHOOL HANDBOOKS** — also previous years in limited numbers. Bargain prices on previous years. Inquiries welcome. Prices reduced on old handbooks..... **\$3.50**

If your old handbooks are worn out or your library wants a complete set for its reference department, write us about your needs. We may be able to supply your wants at the reduced prices on handbooks of previous years.

The Nichols Publication House

11103 EAST RINCON DRIVE

WHITTIER, CALIFORNIA